

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter of Claim 8 and to further limit the maximum pressure of the low pressure fluid. Support for amended Claim 1 can be found at, for example, paragraph [0038] of the published application. Claim 6 has been amended to delete the reference to the pressure. Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled. Claim 9 has been added. Support for Claim 9 can be found at, for example, Fig. 5 and Example 2. Upon entry of this Amendment, which is respectfully requested, Claims 1-6 and 9 will be pending.

**Response to Claim Rejection Under § 112**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

As noted, Claim 7 has been canceled. Thus, this rejection is now moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Response to Claim Rejections Under § 102**

(A) Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP-61084211 to Arimatsu. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Present Claim 1 recites a method of vulcanization-molding a rubber material by heating a vulcanization mold and pushing the rubber material onto a shaping face of the mold through a pressure supplied to an interior of the mold, wherein a low-pressure fluid is supplied to the interior of the mold at an initial stage of the vulcanization molding and after a start of a vulcanization of the rubber material the pressure of the fluid is increased stepwise or stepless, wherein the low-pressure fluid has a pressure of 0.5-0.8 MPa.

Arimatsu discloses three distinct steps wherein the pressure is changed, i.e., (1) 0-3 min, 10kg/cm<sup>2</sup>, (2) 3-10 min, 20kg/cm<sup>2</sup> and (3) 10-30 min, 25kg/cm<sup>2</sup>. In other words, Arimatsu

discloses a pressure of 0.98-2.45 MPa. Thus, Arimatsu fails to anticipate or render obvious the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependence from Claim 1.

(B) Claims 1, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0054782 to Ono.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter of Claim 8, which is not part of the present rejection. Further, Claim 5 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependence from Claim 1. Claim 7 has been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer  
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 1, 2009